



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/965,025	09/27/2001	Robert J. Tait	HALFOR 3.0-001	2637

530 7590 09/28/2006

LERNER, DAVID, LITTENBERG,
KRUMHOLZ & MENTLIK
600 SOUTH AVENUE WEST
WESTFIELD, NJ 07090

EXAMINER

KINDRED, ALFORD W

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2163

DATE MAILED: 09/28/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/965,025

Applicant(s)

TAIT ET AL.

Examiner

Alford W. Kindred

Art Unit

2163

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 July 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 and 21-36 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 and 21-36 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Detailed Action

1. This action is responsive to communications: RCE, filed on 07/14/06.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claims 1, 2-6, and 21-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Davis et al., US# 6,578, 013.

As per claim 1, Nenov et al. teaches “creating and modifying data relating to components specific to the one or more product component suppliers . . . creating and modifying a plurality of collective component groups . . . creating and modifying associations between component identifiers and compatibility groups” (see abstract, col. 2, lines 25-55 and col. 3, lines 1-23, whereas Nenov’s generating of a product code reads on applicant’s teachings involving creating and modifying association between component identifiers . . .) “receiving product identifiers created by an external source and assigning each product identifier to a compatibility group within each collective component group . . . representing products with similar compatibilities . . . providing a search tool whereby said database is queried by product identifier and collective

Art Unit: 2163

component group to return one or more component identifiers . . .” (see col. 3, lines 30-67 and col. 8, lines 45-65).

As per claim 2, this claim is rejected on grounds corresponding to the arguments given above for rejected claim 1 and is similarly rejected including the following:

--Nenov et al. teaches said suppliers exporting said data portion as modified to said administrator, consolidating said data portions received from said suppliers into said database . . .” (see col. 9, lines 34-66 and col. 10, lines 21-47).

As per claim 3, Nenov et al. teaches “assigning the product to an existing compatibility group, assigning the product to a new compatibility group or assigning the product to an unassigned compatibility group” (see col. 11, lines 50-67 and col. 13, lines 54-66).

As per claim 4, this claim is rejected on grounds corresponding to the arguments given above for rejected claim 1 and is similarly rejected.

As per claim 5, Nenov et al. teaches “wherein said component data includes data relating to components from multiple component suppliers” (see col. 17, lines 30-64).

As per claim 6, this claim is rejected on grounds corresponding to the arguments given above for rejected claim 1 and is similarly rejected including the following:

--Nenov et al. teaches “multiple supplier interfaces each allowing access to a part of the data relating to the component . . .” (see col. 10, lines 46-63).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 7-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nenov et al., US# 7,062,509.

As per claims 7-9, Nenov et al. does not explicitly teach "wherein said components are vehicle components and said product identifiers are vehicle details." Davis et al. teaches "wherein said components are vehicle components and said product identifiers are vehicle details" (see col. 10, lines 49-64, whereas Davis' suppliers products teachings, includes vehicle items as claimed in applicant's claim language). It would have been obvious at the time of the invention for one of ordinary skill in the art to have combined the teachings of Nenov and Davis above, because using the steps of "wherein said components are vehicle components and said product identifiers are vehicle details", would have given those skilled in the art the tools to associate components relating to products in an efficient manner. This gives users the advantage of associating vehicle components with the various manufactures faster.

As per claims 21-32, these claims are rejected on grounds corresponding to the arguments given above for rejected claims 1-9 and are similarly rejected including the following:

--Nenov et al. teaches "wherein additional compatibility group product identifiers can be added to list of product . . . to an unassigned . . . central administrator provides standardized product . . ." (see col. 10, lines 21-56).

As per claims 33-36, these claims are rejected on grounds corresponding to the arguments given above for rejected claims 1-3 and 6 and are similarly rejected including the following:


--Nenov et al. teaches "consolidating the data portions from each suppliers . . . interchangeable components are associated with a corresponding compatibility group . . ." (see col. 2, lines 26-63).

Conclusion

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Alford W. Kindred whose telephone number is 571-272-4037. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 9:00 am- 5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Don Wong can be reached on (571) 272-1834. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



Alford W. Kindred
Patent Examiner
Tech Ctr. 2100